

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF MINNESOTA**

Occupy Minneapolis, *et al.*,

Plaintiffs,

Civ. No. 11-3412 (RHK/TNL)

v.

ORDER

County of Hennepin, *et al.*,

Defendants.

This matter is before the Court on Defendants' request (Doc. No. 19) to file a Motion for Reconsideration of the Court's November 23, 2011 Order (Doc. No. 17) granting in part Plaintiffs' Motion for a Temporary Restraining Order. Motions for reconsideration are disfavored and should be granted "only upon a showing of compelling circumstances," D. Minn. L.R. 7.1(h), namely, "to correct manifest errors of law or fact or to present newly discovered evidence." Mumid v. Abraham Lincoln High Sch., Civ. No. 05-2176, 2008 WL 2938159, at *3 (D. Minn. July 22, 2008) (Schiltz, J.) (internal quotation marks and citation omitted). A request for reconsideration should not be granted when it merely seeks to reargue the merits of the underlying motion. See, e.g., Alden v. Mid-Mesabi Assocs. Ltd. P'ship, Civ. No. 06-954, 2008 WL 2828892, at *24 (D. Minn. July 21, 2008) (Tunheim, J., adopting Report & Recommendation of Erickson, M.J.). In the Court's view, that is all Defendants have done here. Based on the foregoing, and all the files, records, and proceedings herein, **IT IS ORDERED** that

Defendant's request (Doc. No. 19) to file a Motion for Reconsideration of this Court's November 23, 2011 Order is **DENIED**.¹

Dated: December 6, 2011

s/Richard H. Kyle
RICHARD H. KYLE
United States District Judge

¹ To the extent Defendants believe the Court committed legal error when ruling on Plaintiffs' Motion for a Temporary Restraining Order, they may fully explain the basis for that belief in response to Plaintiffs' forthcoming motion for preliminary injunction, and this Order should not be construed to prevent them from doing so.